

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 6-9 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Junqua in view of Shaw. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Junqua discloses a method of minimizing the memory footprint of a system in which words are added to a vocabulary stored in a mobile telephone. In Junqua, a “spelled word” is input into a mobile telephone device by either using a keypad or by speaking each letter separately. Each of the letters in the spelled word is then converted into several phonetic transcriptions, and each phonetic transcription is assigned a likelihood of being the correct transcription based on the transcriptions of the surrounding letters and their likelihood. The transcriptions are then analyzed to determine which combinations of transcriptions are most likely to be correct (col. 3, line 37-57). These combinations are then converted into hybrid unit transcriptions using syllabic transcription such that each word is broken down into commonly used syllables and combinations of demi-syllables and phonemes that are used to form less common syllables. Junqua then assigns a predetermined code number to each of the syllables, demi-syllables and phonemes that are represented, such that only a minimal amount of memory is taken to store multiple phonetic representations of the input word.

Unlike applicant’s invention, Junqua does not perform a second conversion to help determine the accuracy of a first conversion. Instead, Junqua discloses a system in which further conversions are only used to reduce a spelled word into known phonetics that likely to represent the spelled word. Additionally, the Examiner states that Junqua fails to disclose “analyzing the output pseudo-orthographic representation to determine if the orthographic if the orthographic input was correctly converted. [However,] Shaw discloses a system for developing word pronunciation pairs for use in a speech recognition system, in which an editing tool is provided for developing word-pronunciation pairs based on a spelled word input. The editing tool includes a transcription generator that receives the spelled word input from the user and generates a list of suggested phonetic transcriptions. The editor displays the list of suggested phonetic transcriptions to the user and provides a mechanism for selecting the desired pronunciation from the list of suggested

phonetic transcriptions[.]” and that it would have been obvious to modify Junqua with the features of Shaw. Applicant’s respectfully disagree.

Shaw discloses a system for developing word-pronunciation pairs based on spelling word input. The editing tool includes a transcription generator that receives the spelled word input from the user and generates a list of suggested phonetic transcriptions. The editor displays the list of suggested phonetic transcriptions to the user and provides a mechanism for selecting the desired pronunciation from the list of suggested phonetic transcriptions. A word-pronunciation pair is an allocation of a spelled word to a phonic transcription.

Shaw also fails to disclose converting the phonetic transcription into a pseudo-orthographic representation and outputting the representation, as required by the claimed invention. Hence, Shaw also fails to show converting of phonetic transcriptions into simply graphemic script units, as required by the claimed invention. Rather, Shaw discloses a mechanism for selecting the desired pronunciation from a list of suggested phonetic transcriptions. This is different from the converting of phonetic transcriptions into simple graphemic script units as required in the claimed invention since Shaw teaches the generation of different phonetic transcription depending on different pronunciation criteria. In the claimed invention, on the other hand, simply graphemic script units are able to show the pronunciations of the converted phonetic transcription in a simple and understandable way. This is advantageous for showing the pronunciation of phonetic transcriptions in different languages in a simplified manner. After correction of the converted graphemic script units, a reconverting in phonetic representations is possible too.

Since the recited method is not disclosed by the applied prior art, claims 1 and 6 are patentable. Claims 2-4, depending from claim 1; and claims 7-9, depending from claim 6, are similarly patentable.

Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Junqua in view of Shaw, further in view of Molnar. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the same reasons presented in the arguments above.

Entry of this amendment after-final is appropriate since the language added to claim 1, was already presented in claim 3, which was previously examined on the merits. In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 449122019600. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: April 12, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Kevin R. Spivak

Registration No.: 43,148

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300

McLean, Virginia 22102

(703) 760-7762